

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

United States of America,)	CRIMINAL NO. 3:04-330-CMC
)	
v.)	OPINION and ORDER
)	
Shawn Sadler,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Defendant, proceeding *pro se*, seeks relief in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Defendant raises several claims relating to alleged deficiencies in his indictment, ineffective assistance of counsel, and error by this court. The Government filed a motion for summary judgment. Pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the court advised Defendant of the summary judgment procedure and the consequences if he failed to respond. Defendant responded to the Government's motion, and this matter is ripe for resolution.

The court has reviewed the complete record in this case. Defendant's conclusory arguments fail to rise to the level of disputed material facts that would have warranted a different result at trial. For the reasons stated in the Government's response, which this court finds to be correct and adopts as its findings, the court grants the Government's motion for summary judgment as to Defendant's claims for relief. Defendant's motion to dismiss the indictment, construed as motion for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, is denied, as is Defendant's motion to conduct discovery.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Government's Motion for Summary Judgment is **granted**. The motions (original as construed and amended) under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 are *denied with prejudice*.

CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

The governing law provides that:

(c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(c)(3) The certificate of appealability . . . shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met. Therefore, a certificate of appealability is **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
February 8, 2011